

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.¹ Claims 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 17-20 and 22-25 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 4, 11, 18, and 23 have been amended to correct a formality, but not for any reason with regard to the patentability of the underlying subject matter.

Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification because it allegedly does not disclose a "computer readable medium" as recited in claims 11, 14 and 17. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Page 5, lines 17-19 of Applicant's specification states, for example, "[e]ach of the server 12 and client respectively have associated therewith a computer readable medium 18, 20 for storing programs which implement the processes, procedures and methods of the herein below described inventive protocol." (*See also*, FIG. 1, emphasis added.)

In light of the example above, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed "computer readable medium" is sufficiently disclosed in the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Rejections Under Section 112, Second Paragraph

Applicant traverses the rejection of Claims 4, 11, 18, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for allegedly lacking proper antecedent basis for the recited "content."² Claims 4, 11, 18 and 23 have been amended to obviate the claim rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 11, 18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

¹ The Office Action contains statements characterizing the claims and related art. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically addressed herein, Applicant's silence as to these characterizations should not be construed as acceptance of them.

² It appears that the Office Action inadvertently rejected Claim 1 instead of Claim 4. As such, claim 4 is addressed rather than claim 1.

Rejection Under Section 101

Claims 4-7, 10, 22, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 allegedly because the recited method claims would not qualify as a statutory process and that the claims should be tied to another statutory class of invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 4 recites several statutory devices, including: “a computer network having a client and a server.” (Emphasis added.) Furthermore, claim 1 requires, *inter alia*, “generating at the client an HTTP path name having an identity of a container within the server,” “transmitting the HTTP path name from the client to the server,” “determining at the server,” “processing at the server,” “generating at the server” and “ transmitting the response from the server to the client.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, the claimed “method” is functionally tied to the above-noted devices. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 satisfies the requirements of Section 101 and, as such, requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 10, 22, and 23-25 have been rejected for similar reasons to Claim 4. For the same reasons discussed above for Claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection to claims 5-7, 10, 22, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is improper.

Rejection of Claims 4-6 & 22-25 Under Section 103

Claims 4-6 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly not being patentable over *Deen* (U.S. 6,629,127) in view of *Klein* (U.S. 6,061,678) and in further view of *McChesney* (U.S. 5,857,102). Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references, whether taken individually or in any proper combination, cannot support a rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because they fail to disclose or suggest the recited subject matter.

The Examiner concedes that *Deen* and *McChesney* do not disclose or suggest “retriev[ing] a snapshot of the identified container of the server if the HTTP path name includes the identity of the container, the snapshot representing the content of the identified

container at a particular point in time" and "generating at the server, from the snapshot a response including the administrative data," as recited in Claim 4. (Office Action, p. 4.) *Klein* does not overcome these deficiencies.³

Klein discloses a method and system for accessing a large object ("LOB"). (*Klein*, col. 2:23). According to *Klein*, an index is built on a column in which the cell resides. The index has a key that includes a LOB identifier. A database server receives from a client a request to access the LOB. The server uses a LOB identifier value for the LOB to traverse the index to locate and index entry for the LOB. (*Klein*, col. 2:24-30).

Additionally, *Klein* discloses the server sends data to the client from a particular "snapshot" of the database to ensure that a particular client sees a consistent view of the database. The snapshot reflects all of the changes to the database as of a particular point in time. When a client reads LOB data, changes that have been made must be removed after the snapshot time being used by the client. (*Klein*, col. 2:51-60.) Moreover, to ensure that the appropriate version of a LOB is sent to a client, the server stores in the snapshot-id field of each in-memory locator a value that indicates the snapshot being used by the client that requested the LOB locator. (*Klein*, cols. 2:65-3:2)

Klein identifies a snapshot of a LOB based on a snapshot-id included in a locator. (*Klein*, col. 2:65-col. 3:2.) However, because the snapshot is identified based on the locator, *Klein* does not disclose or suggest using a "HTTP path name to retrieve a snapshot." (Emphasis added.) Thus, *Klein* also fails to teach or suggest "processing ... the HTTP path name to retrieve a snapshot of the identified container," as recited in claim 4. (Emphasis added.) Moreover, *Klein* also lacks any disclosure or suggestion of "generating at the server, from the snapshot, a response including the administrative data corresponding to the HTTP path name," as recited in claim 4. (Emphasis added.)

³ *Klein* appears to be relied for the same disclosure as U.S. Patent No. 5,999,943 to *Nori*, which was removed from the rejection in favor of *Klein*. As such, *Klein* fails to support a rejection of claim 4 under Section 103 for similar reasons as *Nori*.

Since *Deen*, *McChesney* and *Klein* do not teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 4, these documents cannot support a rejection of claim 4 under Section 103. Claim 4 is, therefore, allowable over the purported combination of *Deen*, *McChesney* and *Klein*. Claims 5, 6 & 22 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 4.

Claim 23, although of different scope than claim 4, recites features similar to those recited in claim 4. Accordingly, claim 23 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 4. Claims 24 & 25 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 4.

Rejection of Claims 7, 10, 11, 14 & 17-20 Under Section 103

Claims 7, 11, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly not being patentable over *Deen* (U.S. 6,629,127) in view of *Klein* (U.S. 6,061,678), *McChesney* (U.S. 5,857,102) and in further view of *Dillingham* (U.S. 6,327,608) and/or *Harrison* (U.S. 6,622,170).

Independent claims 11 & 18 recite similar subject matter to that recited in claims 4 and 23. Accordingly the purported combination of *Deen*, *McChesney* and *Klein* cannot support a rejection of claims 11 & 18 for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 4.

Dillingham is cited for its alleged teaching of transmitting an HTML page if a container is not identified within an HTTP path name. (Office Action, p. 5.) *Harrison* is cited for purportedly disclosing setting path information to allow policy updates. (Office Action, pp. 6-7.) But *Dillingham* and *Harrison* say nothing with regard to a “snapshot” and the Examiner does not rely on *Dillingham* and *Harrison* for any such disclosure or suggestion.

Accordingly, any combination of *Dillingham* and *Harrison* with the purported combination of *Deen*, *Klien* and *McChesney*, still would not teach or suggest the above-

identified features of claim 4. Accordingly, the applied documents cannot support a rejection of claims 4, 11, 18 & 23 under Section 103. Thus, claims 4, 11, 18 & 23 are allowable over the purported combinations *Deen, Klien, McChesney, Dillingham and Harrison*. Claims 7, 10, 14, 17, 19 & 20 are allowable due to their corresponding dependence from claims 4, 11, 18 & 23, in addition to reciting other allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

If additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: April 10, 2009

By: /Steven Ashburn/
Steven Ashburn
Registration No. 56,636

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Customer No. 21839